UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,183	11/27/2006	Takakazu Shiomi	P30534	1989
	7590 06/18/201 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.0	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE		LAY, MICHELLE K	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/18/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/598,183	SHIOMI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHELLE K. LAY	2628
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH:	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication.
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ling date of this communication, even if time	sly filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 20-22 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 20-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) as Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	ccepted or b) objected to by se drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in App iority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment/c)		
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sum	nmary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/N	fail Date mal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/01/2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 06/01/2010 has been entered and made of record. Claims 1-19 are cancelled. Claims 20-22 are pending.

The amendment to claim 21 has overcome the 35 USC §101 rejection mad in the final office action filed 12/10/2009.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/01/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Matsumoto et al. (2003/0080958 A1) fails to teach a specific order for superimposing, storage and overwriting. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Matsumoto teaches using first and second frame buffers (16a-b) (or n frame buffers) corresponding to the number of layers of the multiple layer image. The first and second layers are initially superimposed, and if more layers are needed, the third, fourth

... *n* number layers are added in the order of frame buffers. Furthermore, a display list arranging device (122) arranges or reconstructs the display list generated by the display list generating routine (112) of the drawing application processor (11) for each of the images of the plurality of layers. In the display list arranging device (122), the display list is arranged or reconstructed as to be suitable for the drawing device (13) [0075]. Therefore, a specified order is used to generate the multiple layer image.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 22 recites a computer readable storage medium. Applicant's disclosure defines ROM (215) stores a program to be executed by the CPU (217). The ROM (215) is configured of a Read-Only Memory, a CD-ROM, a DVD, or the like [0063]. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceedings before the USPTO (see *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319 Fed. Cir. 1989). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals *per se* in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent (see MPEP 2111.01). Thus, the

definition of Applicant's computer readable storage medium in the disclosure provides an open ended listing of computer-readable mediums fails to limit the claim to only non-transitory tangible media, and therefore is non-statutory (see *1351 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 212* (February 23, 2010)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **20-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (2003/0080958).

In regards to claim 20, Matsumoto teaches an image generating apparatus that superimposes a plurality of layers for display. Matsumoto teaches a program storage device readable by a computer for tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform an image generating method [0043]. The program can be downloaded through a communication device (said *downloader operable to download the program*) and then executed via the image generating apparatus (said *executioner*) [0044]. The image generating apparatus (1) is provided with a drawing application processor (11), a graphics library (12), a drawing device (13), a graphics memory (16) and a superimposing unit (17) [Fig. 1; 0068]. The image

generating apparatus (1) is designed so as to be able to generate images of the plurality of layers. In order that the drawing device (13) generates a 3D image of the first layer, a first frame buffer (16a) is installed within the graphics memory (16). In order to generate a 3D image of the second layer, a second frame buffer (16b) is installed within the graphics memory (16). Namely, the frame buffers whose number is corresponding to the number of the layers are installed within the graphics memory (16) (said a provider operable to provide ... plurality of storage areas) [0069]. With reference to Fig. 3, the drawing application processor (11) generates a display list for a 3D image. The generated display list is stored as an object display list (1) of the graphics library (12) (said an order storage) [0079]. The display list execution device (123) (said **notifier**) controls the drawing device (13). When generating the 3D image, the display list execution device (123) instructs the scene object setting device (121) and the display list arranging device (122) to send the coordinate transformation information and the arrange or reconstructed display list (said *notification regarding the order stored*) to the drawing device (13) and further instructs the drawing device (13) to execute the image generating process [0076]. If the arranging or reconstruction of the display list is indicated, the display list received from the drawing application processor (11) is arranged or reconstructed (said graphic image is overwritten according to specified order) so as to be suitable for the drawing device (13) [0083]. Therefore, the display list provides the specified order to arrange or reconstruct the layers. The multiple layers within the multiple frame buffers (16a, b ...) are configured so as to be displayed on and outputted as one multiple-layer 3D image to a display unit, after they are superimposed

Application/Control Number: 10/598,183

Art Unit: 2628

by the superimposing unit (17) (said *a display operable to superimpose*) [0069; 0078]. Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 1, the system of Matsumoto teaches the different layers comprising the superimposed image are stored in a first frame buffer (16a), second frame buffer (16b) ... *n* frame buffer, depended on the *n* number of layers. The generated display list provides a specified order in which the layers will be superimposed in [0079]. Thus, the different layers are stored in the order in which the layers will be superimposed as indicated by the display list (said *graphics images* stored in storage areas in accordance with specified order storage).

Page 6

As indicated above, when generating the 3D image, the display list execution device (123) instructs the scene object setting device (121) and the display list arranging device (122) to send the coordinate transformation information and the arrange or reconstructed display list (said *notification regarding the order stored*) to the drawing device (13) and further instructs the drawing device (13) to execute the image generating process [0076]. If the arranging or reconstruction of the display list is indicated, the display list received from the drawing application processor (11) is arranged or reconstructed so as to be suitable for the drawing device (13) [0083]. Therefore, although Matsumoto does not explicitly teach changing the specified order, Matsumoto teaches the display list can be arranged or reconstructed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the arranging or reconstruction of the display list can indicate a change to the display order (i.e., specified order) of the plurality of layers of the multiple layer image.

In regards to claim **21**, claim 21 recites similar limitations as claim 20 but in process form. Therefore, the same rationale used for claim 20 is applied. Furthermore, Matsumoto teaches the process implemented by the system described in the rationale of claim 20 within Fig. 3 [0079].

In regards to claim 22, claim 22 recites similar limitations as claim 20 but in manufacture form. Therefore, the same rationale used for claim 20 is applied. Furthermore, Matsumoto teaches the program storage device (said *computer readable storage medium*) readable by a computer for tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform an image generating method [0043].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle K. Lay whose telephone number is (571) 272-7661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30a-3:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee M. Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/598,183 Page 8

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michelle K. Lay/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628 16 June 2010